



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wisconsin farmer of today, because such agriculture pays; but are we to suppose that the farmer of fifty years ago was less sensitive to his best economic interests in the raising of wheat? He raised wheat year after year because it paid him to do so. As Professor Daniells is quoted (p. 27): "Poor farming was the only profitable farming and consequently the only good farming; an agriculturo-economical paradox from which there is [was] no escape." There was a wheat-growing stage in the movement of civilization westward, and to question the wisdom of the prolonged part played by the Wisconsin farmer in it is as futile as to disparage the days of the hand loom. A better appreciation of economic evolution, in its relation to agriculture, would give full credit to the early wheat-raiser of the country and to the methods he employed.

On the other hand one regrets that a fuller and more detailed account was not given of the progress made in technical improvements in agricultural machinery during the period covered. This progress is a real and vital part of all modern agriculture. A similar criticism or suggestion might be made respecting a more thorough analysis of the effects of the panics of 1857 and 1873, and likewise of the Civil War, on the agriculture of the state and on wheat-raising in particular. Too much stress and credit, we are disposed to think, have been given to dairying as a substitute for wheat-raising, and not enough consideration to the various crops now so generally cultivated. Has adequate attention been given, some will ask, to the discouraging effects and general destruction of chinch bugs, etc., in limiting the crop within the state? Are not these things the real obstacles to wheat-raising, or the risk to which the farmer in Wisconsin is subject even today?

One other difference of opinion might be raised. After all was not the decline of wheat-growing in Wisconsin largely due to causes *outside* the state rather than to factors and forces working *within* the state? The state has been treated in this matter too much as an isolated economic community, and no state, similarly situated, can have an isolated economic development. And this leads us to our final comment: What is to be gained by such a study within purely artificial political state lines? It is doubtful whether the wheat belt can be satisfactorily studied by breaking it up into parts along the mere cleavage of state or county boundaries. Politically speaking, it may be desirable to know what Wisconsin has done at wheat-raising, but the subject, we think, has too broad an economic bearing to be treated within the confines of a single state.

With these limitations it is to be hoped, however, that a work, in *most* respects so generally satisfactory and so thoroughly carried out, may prove a substantial contribution to economics and history, and to the growing subject of agricultural economics in particular.

ARTHUR J. BOYNTON

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Parenthood and Race Culture: An Outline of Eugenics. By CALEB W. SALEEBY. New York: Moffatt, Yard & Co., 1909. 8vo, pp. xv+389. \$2.50 net.

Any serious work on eugenics deserves to be taken very seriously. The reader who takes up for review this book by Dr. Saleeby has special reason to open it with expectant interest. If he has read the periodicals he will already have

seen the book advertised as "the first complete work on eugenics" and hailed by a reckless fellow-reviewer as "epoch-making as Darwin's first announcement to the world." If he then searches Dr. Saleeby's unlucky preface for the key to what is to follow, he finds, in a litter of afterthoughts such as other prefaces have made too familiar, two phrases which demand much from the remainder of the book. The author states with his opening sentence that he has made "a first attempt to survey and define the whole field of eugenics . . ." (p. vii). "I claim for eugenics," he presently observes, "that it is the final and only judge of all proposals and principles, however labeled, new or old, orthodox or heterodox" (p. ix). The reader thus carries with him into the early chapters an apparent invitation not only to compare them with what has been written on this subject, which we now call eugenics, during the past half-century, but to measure them, in terms of human importance, against all that has ever been written on anything. The standard of judgment has certainly been set high.

A book on eugenics might be expected, at the present stage in the development of the subject, to take one of four forms. It might consist of a critical review and appraisal of what has thus far been achieved in the study. It might outline what a systematic science of eugenics should be; defining its content, scrutinizing its assumptions, and fitting it into the general scheme of scientific thought. It might, with less scientific pretension, preach eugenics as an apparent, though still unproven, moral duty, and prepare public opinion for a thoughtful consideration of more conclusive work later. Finally, it might contribute new evidence to explain the biological principles on which all eugenic policies ultimately rest. Of these four forms the second promises least usefulness. Dr. Saleeby's "attempt to survey and define the whole field" would imply that he had this difficult second form in view. As a matter of fact his volume is neither one thing nor another. To experimental evidence it contributes nothing; but it deals incompletely with each of the other three phases of the subject which have been indicated. Almost inevitably, then, the reader is at first struck with a sense of the inadequacy of the work. Ruskin's insistence that "there is no wealth but life" affords an uncertain foundation on which to build a science. Dr. Saleeby seems to think of life too exclusively as the reproducing of life. One wonders why the mere reproducer is so much worth reproducing. Here, as at many other points, the enthusiastic advocate dominates the man of science in the author's thinking. He is so full of faith in eugenics that he apparently cannot be judicial. His ethical views, too, seem to be personal convictions which shift from one sanction to another—mystical, customary, utilitarian—as the needs of eugenics dictate. And he is unpleasantly intolerant of critics who have been more questioning and less serene than he.

But if one ceases to seek for a rounded system of thought and notices the excellences of detail one finds much to commend. Dr. Saleeby's great merit is his moderation, so far as recommendations for conduct go. He is no advocate of chloroform and surgery, and no zealot for fantastic affirmative attainments by means of selection—except in the far future. He pleads for negative selection by the utilization of means already at hand. Because he holds motherhood the greatest of human functions, he would realize to the utmost its possibilities for human improvement. The agency of woman in marriage selection, also, is to him a eugenic means of great promise, and—

granting an accepted standard of selection—he is to be commended in his contention that it should be possible to build up a eugenic system of *tabu* as unquestioned and imperious as are the dictates of conventional usage in matters of less concern. “It is the business of those who believe that eugenics is the greatest ideal in the world to make a eugenist of Mrs. Grundy” (p. 231).

Two topics have been emphasized by Dr. Saleeby in a way to deserve special comment. One is the class of influences which he denominates “the racial poisons.” As racial poisons he enumerates alcohol, lead, narcotics, syphilis; but it is to alcohol that he gives his attention, and in the elucidation of its effects on the race he marshals facts and masses his evidence as nowhere else in the book. Moreover he does not rest his case on one sort of evidence, but deals with four: the somewhat uncertain degeneracy of germ-plasm as a result of alcoholism; the probable evidence of inherent and transmissible degeneracy which habitual drunkenness affords; and the undisputed evils of foetal intoxication and neglect in infancy which menace the children of drunken mothers. Granting that this is the writing of a partisan and perhaps an extremist, the chapter carries its unavoidable lesson.

The second point of emphasis is the psychical qualification for parenthood. Dr. Saleeby rightly rebels against the purely rationalistic ideal of motherhood as essentially a source of unexceptionable inheritance. The eugenic mother must be motherly. If only we make allowances for mother-instinct which has been obscured by ill-advised education or which has not had early awakening, we can heartily agree with the author’s distrust of the “worker bee” woman as a prospective parent, and with his skepticism about the giving of bonuses to encourage the marriage of persons who felt no other motive.

On the whole Dr. Saleeby has shown himself in this book as a popularizer. To the public such thought as this is still unhappily new. Here it is presented in an incisive and unusually vivid style, and with clear conviction. Something suggests that the book grew out of lectures. In style as well as in substance it is stronger as parts than as a whole. We cannot think of it as the message of any second Darwin; but it may yet be a message well suited to the time. In one city, at least, and at one time, the book has been posted as a “best seller.” The author more than once has declared that his desire is to be a prophet of the new and better understanding of social needs. To create sound opinion is the expressed purpose of his book (p. 158). For its promise of awakening wider interest it is welcome; but if we seek a satisfying science of eugenics the reader of the book must agree with its author that this is still to come.

JAMES A. FIELD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Liberty and Progress. By C. Y. C. DAWBARN. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909. 8vo, pp. xvi+339. 9s.

Liberty and Progress is an endeavor to adjust the programme of social reform to the philosophy of individualism. The method of treatment of the subject does not follow the usual plan and the style of expression is not the one a reader usually meets in works dealing with this subject.

Reforms are looked upon with skepticism by the author. At the very